

APTIV-7624

Patent

**REMARKS:**

In response to the Final Office Action mailed February 25, 2005, claims 15-17, 24-29, 31-36, 41-54, 62-72, 74-75, and 78-89 have been canceled without prejudice, claims 1, 19, 38, and 56 have been amended, and new claim 90 has been added in order to more particularly claim the subject matter of the present application.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-11, 15-32, 36-50, 54-68, and 72-89 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,081,263 ("the LeGall et al. reference") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,463,468 ("the Buch et al. reference"), and claims 12-14, 33-35, 51-53, and 69-71 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the LeGall et al. reference in view of the Buch et al. reference and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,481,010 ("the Nishikawa et al. reference"). Because the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter of the present claims, the rejections should be withdrawn.

Turning to the present claims, claim 1 recites a method for simultaneously displaying a video program and supplemental information that includes: displaying a first video content having an original size on a display; in response to a request for supplemental information from a user watching the display, converting the first video content to a format having a predetermined reduced size, wherein the first video content is reduced in size from the original size and displayed on a first portion of the display, the predetermined reduced size occupying a major portion of the display; and converting data associated with the supplemental information to a format wherein at least one of textual content and graphic content representing at least a portion of the supplemental

APTIV-7624  
Patent

information is displayed on a second portion of the display different from the first portion of the display at the same time as the first video content is displayed on the first portion of the display, wherein the first video content is reduced in size and displayed on the first portion of the display and the supplemental data is displayed on the second portion of the display in response to the request for supplemental information from the user watching the display.

None of the cited references discloses, teaches, or suggests such a method. First, the LeGall et al. reference does not teach or suggest anything about converting a first video content having an original size to a format having a predetermined reduced size, wherein the first video content is reduced in size from the original size and displayed on a first portion of the display. In addition, the LeGall et al. reference fails to teach or suggest a predetermined reduced size occupying a major portion of the display. Instead, at most, the LeGall et al. reference discloses a display window 720 that occupies a minor portion of the display (see FIG. 7C, col. 7, lines 16-18), similar to the devices discussed in paragraph 8 of the Background of the present application.

The Buch et al. reference fails to provide sufficient additional disclosure, teaching, or suggestion to render claim 1 obvious. First, the Buch et al. reference does not teach or suggest converting a first video content having an original size to a format having a predetermined reduced size. Instead, the Buch et al. reference states that the disclosed control bar “permits a user to modify, within predetermined limits, the size of the window 406.” (Col. 10, lines 42-48). Thus, the Buch et al. reference teaches that a user can request and change the size of the window to any size within the predetermined limits. In contrast, claim 1 recites that the video content is converted to a format having a predetermined reduced size, not a range of sizes.

APTIV-7624  
Patent

Further, claim 1 recites that the video content is converted to a format having a predetermined reduced size “in response to a request for supplemental information.” Unlike claim 1, the Buch et al. reference discloses a user changing the size of a display window directly, i.e., based upon a request to change the size of the window. For these reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims are not obvious, even if the Buch et al. reference is somehow combined with the LeGall et al. reference.

Turning to the Nishikawa et al. reference, the limitations missing from the other cited references are also missing from the Nishikawa et al. reference. For example, the Nishikawa et al. reference fails to teach or suggest converting a first video content having a original size to a format having a predetermined reduced size in response to a request for supplemental information. More specifically, the Nishikawa et al. reference does not teach or suggest that the predetermined reduced size occupies a major portion of the display. Instead, similar to the LeGall et al. reference, at most, the Nishikawa et al. reference discloses a window occupying a minor portion of a display (see, e.g., FIG. 10). For these reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims are not obvious in light of the cited references.

For similar reasons, claims 19, 38, 56, and their dependent claims are also not obvious in light of the cited references. Although presented as a computer system, apparatus, and computer program product, respectively, each of these claims includes the same limitations discussed above that are wholly absent from the cited references.

APTIV-7624  
Patent

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims now presented in this application define patentable subject matter over the cited prior art. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

COHEN SAKAGUCHI & ENGLISH LLP

Dated: August 25, 2005

By 

William A. English  
Reg. No. 42,515  
Attorneys for Applicant

2040 Main Street, 9<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Irvine, CA 92614  
Telephone: (562) 665-3953  
Facsimile: (949) 625-8955